

REMARKS

Claims 23 – 30 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19-22 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cao (U.S. Pat. No. 5,965,281). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 23 has been amended to recite a method of manufacturing an electro-optical device having functional elements selectively applied on an applying position surrounded by a partition wall. Claim 23 has also been amended to recite a step of sending the composition to a liquid material ejecting means through a passage, and applying the composition on the applying position surrounded by the partition wall on the base substrate with the liquid material ejecting means, thereby forming a film which will become components of the functional elements. Cao does not teach or suggest such a method. More specifically, referring to Figures 13, 14, and 15 of Cao, it can be seen that no partition walls are shown. Furthermore, Cao is completely silent with respect to any teaching or suggestions of a method including a step of sending the

composition to liquid material ejecting means through a passage, and applying the composition on the applying position surrounded by the partition wall on the base substrate with the liquid material ejecting means, thereby forming a film which will become components of the functional elements, as claimed. Because this aspect of the claimed invention is neither taught nor suggested, claim 23 is not anticipated by Cao.

With respect to claim 27, this claim has also been amended and rewritten. More specifically, claim 27 now recites a method of manufacturing an organic electroluminescent device having a plurality of material layers selectively applied on an applying position surrounded by a partition wall. The method comprises a step of applying the composition on the applying position surrounded by the partition wall on the base substrate with the liquid material ejecting means. As stated above, Cao fails to anticipate or suggest a step of applying a composition on an applying position surrounded by a partition wall on a base substrate. This is because, as shown in Figures 13, 14, and 15 of Cao, it can be seen that there is no teaching or suggestion of a partition wall. Furthermore, the entire disclosure of Cao is completely silent with respect to any suggestion or motivation to apply a composition on an applying position surrounded by a partition wall on a base substrate. Because this aspect of the claimed method is neither disclosed, taught, nor suggested, claim 27 and each corresponding dependent claim are not anticipated by Cao.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Imamura (U.S. Pat. No. 2003/0175552). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that the claimed invention is anticipated by Imamura. Notwithstanding, Applicant respectfully notes that Imamura has a U.S. filing date of November 18, 2002. In contrast, the claimed invention claims priority to Japanese Patent Application 2002-192195 which was filed on July 1, 2002. Accordingly, to remove the Imamura reference from consideration, Application hereby perfects their claim of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 by providing an English translation (attached hereto) of Japanese Patent Application 2002-192195. Because Applicant has perfected their claim of priority to Japanese Patent Application 2002-192195, Applicant respectfully asserts that Imamura no longer qualifies as prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 29 and 30 have been added. These new claims are supported throughout the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Specifically, the subject matter of claim 29 is supported at paragraph [0119], and the subject matter of claim 30 is supported at paragraph [0117]. Favorable consideration of these new claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

Sept 13, 2005

By: _____

G. Gregory Sonney
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/JAH